

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRANCISCO VEGA, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

M. SOTO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00471-JLT-EPG (PC)

ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S  
NOTICE FOR CLARIFICATION

(ECF No. 45)

Plaintiff Francisco Vega, Jr., is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action. The Court entered a scheduling order on April 26, 2023, among other things, limiting the parties to “serve on any other party no more than 15 interrogatories.” (ECF No. 42, p. 3). Plaintiff has filed a request for clarification of the limit on interrogatories. (ECF No. 45). Specifically, Plaintiff states that it appears that the Court made a mistake because Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a) provides for a limit of 25 written interrogatories, not 15. However, he also notes that this default applies “[u]nless otherwise . . . ordered by the court.” He asks whether the Court intended to exercise its power to limit the number of interrogatories from 25 to 15.

Plaintiff is advised that the Court’s order does limit the number of default interrogatories from 25 to 15 in this case. However, as noted in the order, “[i]f a party wishes to serve additional discovery requests, that party may file a motion for additional discovery requests with the Court, explaining why additional discovery requests are necessary.”

\\

\\

Based on the above, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. Plaintiff's request for clarification (ECF No. 45). is granted to the extent that the Court confirms that it is exercising its power to reduce the default number of written interrogatories from 25 to 15 in this case.
2. If Plaintiff wishes to serve additional interrogatories, he may file a motion, explaining why additional interrogatories are needed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 22, 2023

/s/ Eric P. Grogan  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE